DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 279 FL 013 108

AUTHOR Cripwell, Kenneth, Ed.; Geddes, Marion, Ed.
TITLE Microteaching and EFL Teacher Training. A Report of a Workshop. Working Documents 1.
INSTITUTION London Univ. (England). Inst. of Education.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 65p.; There is some broken type. Workshop held at London Institute of Education (December 14-15, 1978). For related documents, see FL 013 109-111.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute of Education, University of London, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H OAL, England (One pound).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Language Teachers; *Microteaching; *Second Language Instruction; Student Teachers; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A workshop on microteaching and foreign language teacher training was held at the London Institute of Education in December, 1978. The papers presented in this volume are the papers that were prepared for this workshop as well as one paper that was commissioned during the workshop. The contributions are as follows: (1) "Microteaching and Foreign Language Teacher Training," by Marion Geddes; (2) "A Seven-day Microteaching Programme for EFL Teachers," by Christopher Brumfit; and (3) "Microteaching in the Training of Teachers of English as a Second or Foreign Language," by Kenneth Cripwell. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

WORKING DOCUMENTS 1

ED224279

MICROTEACHING

AND EFL TEACHER TRAINING

A report of a workshop

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth Cripwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Edited by

Kenneth Cripwell
Marion Geddes

ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

FL013108

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Microteaching and foreign language teacher training by Marion Geddes	3
Bibliography	25
A seven-day microteaching programme for EFL teachers by Christopher Brumfit	30
Microteaching in the training of teachers of English as a second or foreign language by Kenneth Cripwell	38
Course programme	44
Microteaching Workshop/Seminar: reports on group discussions	47
Plenary discussion	53
Appendix A - List of participants	57

ED224280

MICROTEACHING AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER TRAINING

Marion Geddes

FL013109

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two years a series of meetings have been held by staff concerned with the teaching of English as a second or foreign language in the United Kingdom jointly with the British Council to discuss matters of common interest. The first meeting held at Easter 1977 at the London Institute of Education was organised by Chris Brumfit, on the subject of initial courses. The second meeting held at Easter 1978 at the London Institute of Education was organised by John Norrish on the subject of Diploma courses. At this meeting it was agreed to hold a further meeting in December 1978 on the subject of microteaching and foreign language teacher training.

The workshop was held at the London Institute of Education on 14th and 15th December, 1978. The workshop was organised jointly by Kenneth Cripwell of the Institute of Education and Marion Geddes of the British Council. A list of the participants appears as Appendix A.

This collection of papers consists of a number of papers prepared for the workshop and distributed prior to the workshop as well as one paper commissioned from Chris Brumfit during the workshop. These papers consist of the following:

1. A general survey of microteaching and foreign language teacher training by Marion Geddes.

2. A seven-day microteaching programme for EFL teachers by Christopher Brumfit.

3. An account of the use of microteaching in the training of EFL teachers in the PGCE by Kenneth Cripwell.

This section is followed by the programme of the workshop and an account of the discussions.

We hope that this collection of papers will help to focus attention on the possibilities which microteaching offers the EFL teacher trainer and that it will lead to further experimentation and analysis.

Kenneth Cripwell
Marion Geddes

MICROTEACHING AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER TRAINING

1. WHAT IS MICROTEACHING?

For many years microteaching has been widely used in teacher-training institutions in the United States. In Britain interest in the technique has developed rapidly over the last few years and microteaching is now a component of many foreign language (FL) courses.

The difficulty of adequately defining "microteaching" reflects the developments that microteaching has undergone. 'The term microteaching was first coined in 1963, but the concept has never been a static one. It continues to grow and change and develop both in focus and format' (Allen and Ryan 1969, p. vi). Today many variations on the original theme are practised.

The two essential features of the technique are a simplification of the teaching situation and the provision of feedback. 'Microteaching provides teachers with a practice setting for instruction in which the normal complexities of the classroom are reduced and in which the teacher receives a great deal of feedback on his performance. To minimise the complexities of the normal teaching encounter, several dimensions are limited. The length of the lesson is reduced. The scope of the lesson is narrowed. In microteaching, the teacher instructs only a few students instead of the normal 25 or 30' (ibid, p. 1-2).

Microteaching grew out of dissatisfaction with existing methods of teaching practice. At the same time a new view of teaching emerged. This saw teaching as behaviour which is essentially skill-orientated: the teacher selects from a large number of skills as appropriate to a particular classroom situation and to realise particular teaching objectives. This view is incompatible with conventional approaches to teacher training. The most widespread of these, the 'model the master' approach described by Stones and Morris (1972), views teaching as a process that can be

learnt by observing and imitation the behaviour, attitudes and personality of a 'master' teacher. The college supervisor cannot plan or anticipate what particular skills the student teacher will observe and when the student starts practising teaching in a classroom he relies on imitating bits of behaviour he has observed or on recalling the behaviour and attitudes of teachers in his own school days. 'The model the master teacher approach ..... stands for imitation rather than analysis and it puts obstacles in the way of understanding the processes of teaching' (ibid, p. 10).

This is not to say that microteaching is intended to replace school teaching practice. At some stage the student should be given - and will want - the opportunity to put into practice in the classroom what he has learnt in the college. Students often complain however, of the gap that exists between these two domains. Microteaching is seen as a useful technique to help bridge the gap. Because the microteaching setting can be controlled, the relationship between theory and practice can be made more apparent. Attention can be focussed on particular skills and strategies before the student practises putting them together in a real classroom.

The controlled microteaching setting offers other advantages. The highly complex situation of the classroom is one that most students face with considerable trepidation. Microteaching can help build up the student's confidence as he concentrates on limited objectives without the fear of the unexpected. He is also given continual feedback and guidance related to his performance from his tutor and other sources. During teaching practice he will get little feedback: practical problems of distance and timetabling make it difficult for the tutor to observe his students. Guidance and feedback during microteaching can help the student to analyse his own performance and so reduce his dependance on the tutor's observations.

2. MICROTEACHING MODELS IN FL TEACHER TRAINING

Microteaching was pioneered at Stanford University in California. The Stanford model envisaged a six stage cycle: Plan - Teach - Observe (Critique) - Replan - Reteach - Reobserve. In the Teach and Reteach stages the teacher gives the same lesson to two different groups of real students. (Students are paid to participate). Each group has an average of five students and each lesson is planned to last four to ten minutes. The Observe sessions provide feedback to the teacher. This feedback can be given by a tutor, by the pupils, by the teacher's peers or by various types of rating form. Audio and video recordings are also used. Each cycle practises a particular teaching skill. Typically these include set and closure (beginning and ending a lesson), effective questioning, variation, pupil reinforcement, pupil participation. Lectures and demonstrations are given at the beginning of each cycle to illustrate the particular skill.

The original Stanford model emphasised the role of the teacher and the learning of general educational skills. Reviewing work at Stanford, Brusling (1974, p. 23) notes that from 1963 to 1972 the emphasis gradually changed:

1. from being teacher-centred to being pupil-centred;
2. from general to subject-specific goals;
3. from isolated to integrated skill training;
4. from given goals to active participation by student teachers in formulating goals;
5. from the use of paid pupils to the use of, and attention to, pupils with a teaching need.

In 1965 Robert Politzer was the first to apply the model to FL teaching. This involved a definition of skills relevant to FL teaching and the preparation of performance criteria for FL teachers (Politzer 1967). This was a bold step forward. In spite of a considerable amount of research, little is known about the characteristics of effective teachers and the behaviour required for effective teaching

(see Dunkin and Biddle 1974). One of the benefits that microteaching has conferred on FL teaching is that it has forced its users to look at the problem of defining effective teaching behaviour from a new perspective. Thus Carver and Wallace (1975) conclude that one of their gains from experimenting with microteaching has been to force them 'to examine in very great detail just what happens in certain teaching areas' (p. 186). Beattie and Teacher (1971) comment: 'The need to devise some appropriate exercise for practising gesture certainly forced the tutors involved to work out the significance and function of gesture in the modern language classroom'' (p. 120).

Decisions as to what aspects of teaching behaviour we can most usefully isolate for microteaching practice are obviously affected by a number of factors. These will include the time available for microteaching, the course objectives, how microteaching relates to other parts of the course, whether the course is for pre-service or in-service teachers. The most important factor however, is a knowledge of what aspects of behaviour contribute most significantly to effective classroom behaviour.

Language teachers are perhaps fortunate in that much language teaching behaviour can be described in terms of teaching the four basic skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) or in terms of methods or approaches. Politzer's task in defining performance criteria was made possible by the fact that he was able to relate his criteria to a widely accepted approach to language learning, the audio-lingual method. Krumm (1973) implies that if one does not relate skills to teaching method the alternative is 'elementary, non-specific skills' (p. 163). Johnstone (1977) also feels the need to relate skills to 'strategies' or methods. He gives the skill of explanation as an example of one that is appropriate to a grammar-translation strategy but not to an audio-lingual strategy. He adds however, that the notions of skill and strategy require further definition, particularly as strategies commonly referred to in methodological textbooks are rarely to be observed in FL classrooms.

A consideration of microteaching as a technique for the practice of skills is, of course, directly influenced by the original Stanford model. The relation of skills to strategies in language teaching is in line with the change of emphasis in work at Stanford noted by Brusling and quoted above, namely, the change from isolated to integrated skill training. Johnstone (1977) supports his feeling that skills and strategies should be more closely related by recalling the case of a student who scored high on the skill 'variation' by using a number of visual aids, a variety of gestures and individual and choral pupil responses and yet effected little or no learning. It is not a question of using a skill ffequently but of using it effectively. Applebee (1976) notes a similar distortion of normal teaching in other subject areas and asserts that concentration on isolated skills can mean that some of the practice that teachers get is practice in poor teaching.

A survey of the literature on the use of microteaching for FL teaching shows that microteaching has been used for practising and discussing a wide range of behaviours. Carver and Wallace (1977) identify five models in their use of microteaching techniques: classical skills-analysis microteaching, problem-centred microteaching, exploratory microteaching, demonstration microteaching and non-participant microteaching. I would now like to look at each of these models in turn.

1. <u>Classical skills-analysis microteaching</u>

This model is 'classical' in that, of the five models proposed it is the one closest in design to the original Stanford model. Thus, the behaviour required of the microteacher is specified beforehand. An area of subject-oriented teaching behaviour is broken down into skills. These are discussed with the microteachers and then practice of the skills is given by asking the microteachers to perform prescribed tasks.

Examples include:

1.1 Prepare for written composition by eliciting the opening sentence from a pupil; get two more suggestions for

the opening sentence; put the alternatives on the board in an orderly manner, etc.

1.2 Prepare for intensive reading of a passage by (i) asking at least three questions each on pupil's general knowledge and pupil's own experience; (ii) asking at least two questions which can be answered with reference to the main point in paragraph 1.

Teaching is done with peers and, as described by Carver and Wallace (1975), reteach sessions are used.

It is clear that in this model skills are closely related to strategies. Other teacher trainers describe a similar approach. Cripwell (1976) for example requires microteachers to conduct a language drill practising a particular grammatical structure. For initial presentation and discussion of the skill he uses a section from the film 'Teaching English in Primary Schools in Hong Kong' and Robert Lado's breakdown of language drill types.

Politzer (1969) relates microteaching tasks to the audio-lingual approach. He describes how skills practice in microteaching can focus on either 'teaching behaviour' or 'subject matter' or a mixture of the two. For example, microteachers may practise the lesson 'Teaching Pronunciation', illustrating specified performance criteria, but paying particular attention to 'providing immediate feedback and reinforcement'.

Johnstone (1977) uses his 'Microteaching Model 1' to practise three skills: 'variation', 'questioning' and 'reacting'. Microteaching sessions are closely related to a course on Lesson Planning given jointly by a psychologist and a modern language tutor. The three skills are practised individually, usually within a language teaching context. The microlessons last ten to fifteen minutes and are given to five or six pupils from local secondary schools. At the end of the semester an additional longer lesson is given to practise all three micro-skills together.

2. Problem-centred microteaching

The main difference between this model and the preceding one is that skills analysis is arrived at during feedback on the microlesson. This allows teachers to try out different approaches to particular tasks. Some of the tasks are similar to those practised in Model 1 in that they can be anticipated in the lesson plan. Examples given are 'getting pupils to use contextually grammatical structures which they have practised formally' and 'dealing with vocabulary difficulties in a reading passage'. Other tasks require the teacher to cope with problems that can arise unexpectedly during a lesson, for example, 'A pupil makes an incidental grammatical mistake in the course of the course' (sic). The teacher may be warned that the problem is going to occur but will not know when or in what form. Feedback focuses on how the problem was dealt with and may advise on alternative procedures.

Yorke (1977) questions whether this model, which he also uses, can be described as microteaching, since discussion and analysis of the teaching skills arise out of the teaching, while the Stanford model specifies the required skills before the teaching. However, as the model includes the two essential features of microteaching, namely, the provision of feedback and a simplification of the teaching situation, I see no reason not to describe it as microteaching.

3. Exploratory microteaching

This model is more loosely structured than the preceding ones. The microlesson is longer (12-15 minutes) and the discussion that follows may cover a wide variety of pedagogic problems.

This model appears to be widely used in FL teacher training, particularly on in-service courses where teachers and peers can relate problems to previous personal experience. Lessons are sometimes as long as 30 minutes. Teachers plan them in teams of two to five and teach sections of the lesson in turn (Beattie and Feather 1971; DeLorenzo 1975). Johnstone (1977)

in his Model 2 describes how pre-service student teachers work in small teams of two or three with the same class of fifteen final year primary school pupils for one lesson per week for eight weeks.

Students sometimes complain that microteaching is artificial. One reason for the popularity of this longer model is certainly that it is nearer 'the real thing'.

4. Demonstration microteaching

This model appears to be a variation on Model 1. It involves demonstration of the skill before it is practised and is mainly for the benefit of pre-service students who are unable to relate discussion of skills to a real teaching situation.

The usefulness of demonstration (usually on film or videotape) is widely accepted. With the increased use of videorecordings demonstration material should become more easily available.

5. Non-participant microteaching

This model envisages the viewing and discussion of videotapes of other teachers doing microlessons, or samples from real lessons. No practice or imitation of the skill(s) is involved.

At the moment this model suffers, like Model 4, from a shortage of appropriate videotape or film material.

Carver and Wallace are among the first FL teacher trainers to attempt a categorisation of microteaching. It must be added that they have identified the five models described here in order to categorise their own use of microteaching. They did not intend them for general application. However, as some form of categorisation is useful as a framework for discussion it seems worth considering to what extent their categorisation can be adapted.

The five models are not mutually exclusive. This is because they are based on both procedural criteria and criteria which relate to training aims. This mixture of criteria is apparent

in the names given to the models. 'Skills-analysis', 'problem-solving' and 'exploratory' all suggest training aims, while 'classical', 'demonstration' and 'non-participant' suggest procedures. Some confusion is also apparent in the descriptions of the models. Model 2, for example, is distinguished from Model 1 on procedural grounds: the analysis of skills takes place after the microlesson. However, at least one of the examples of Model 2 suggests that a distinction is also being made between the two models on the basis of training aims.

Many users of microteaching have commented on the importance of making clear to students the aims of microteaching sessions. A categorisation of different approaches to microteaching in terms of aims rather than procedures might help both tutors and students. Categorisation can also be too restrictive of course. One microteaching session may have several objectives, for example, to analyse and practise a particular skill, to relate the practice of the skill to psychological theory, to relate the skill to particular subject matter, to give the student teacher experience of success in a scaled-down FL teaching situation. This flexibility in microteaching is indeed one of its strengths.

I suggest, therefore, that only two models should be identified. Retaining some of Carver and Wallace's terminology these could be called:

1. Skills-analysis microteaching
2. Exploratory microteaching

Within each model it is possible to focus on:

i. subject matter
ii. teacher behaviour
iii. pupil-teacher interaction

or a combination of these.

I have already quoted Politzer's example of skills-analysis microteaching that focuses on subject matter and teacher behaviour. An example of focus on pupil-teacher interaction is the role-playing with microteaching I have used at Oranim School of Education in Israel with Hana Raz, where feedback from role-playing 'pupils' and videorecordings focuses on interaction (Geddes and Raz 1979).

Within these two models numerous procedural variations are possible. As we have seen from Carver and Wallace's models skills may be analysed before or after the microlesson; a lesson may last anywhere between four and 30 minutes; teaching may be done with peers or real pupils; feedback may come from a number of sources.

It may be necessary to add to these two models at a later stage but for present descriptive purposes in FL teacher-training, two seem sufficient.

3. INVESTIGATIONS OF MICROTEACHING

References I have already made to studies of FL microteaching are to descriptive case studies. Their conclusions are useful. However, if we are looking for help or insights from experimental research we must refer to subject matter other than foreign languages and to general teaching behaviour. In this section I wish to look at both case studies and research studies.

A considerable amount of research effort has gone into the subject of microteaching. A small part of this has been aimed at establishing whether microteaching is more effective than conventional methods of teacher training. Allen and Fortune (1966) and Kallenbach and Gall (1969) both compared the performance of students who spent one hour per day for 15 days in microteaching laboratories with that of students who had three weeks of teaching normal classes in schools. In both experiments results marginally favoured the microteaching groups. Microteaching however, achieved results in one fifth of the time, with fewer pupils and was

easier to organise. Yorke (1977) studied the relative effect on classroom performance of two methodology courses. The first course was lecture-based. The second required students to develop their teaching through a form of micro-teaching that omitted a preliminary stage: specification of teaching skills. Video recordings of the microlessons were used by the tutor to guide discussion towards matters covered during the lecture course given to the first group. No significant difference in classroom performance was found between the two groups. The research however, was conducted with a very small sample and both courses lasted only a few hours.

MacLeod and McIntyre (1977) argue that research comparing microteaching with conventional approaches is misguided. As we saw in Section 1 of this paper, microteaching arose out of a new view of the nature of teaching. This implies that old approaches to training must be re-examined and new ones developed. One might add that by now sufficient practical experience has been gained for us to be assured that micro-teaching techniques have considerable potential. It is more interesting, therefore, to consider these two questions: 'What factors affect the contribution that microteaching techniques can make to teacher training?' and 'Are there alternative or supplementary techniques that could be developed?'

The majority of research on microteaching has been concerned with the effect of procedural alternatives at different stages of the microteaching cycle. We will look first at research of this kind. We will then consider a study of students' attitudes and finally consider alternative or supplementary techniques to microteaching.

1. Modelling

Usually the first stage in the cycle is analysis and specification of the behaviour to be practised. This is done through explanation and discussion and, where possible, with reference to one or more models of the behaviour either on film or videotape. Experimental researchers have tried to establish the most effective

form of modelling. Gilmore (1977) for example, considered the effects of positive and negative models on student teachers' questioning behaviour. He found that on the whole the positive model group performed significantly better than the negative model group. Young (1969) also favoured demonstration of positive examples.

Gibb (1968) looked at the effect of a dubbed commentary on some video models of German language classes. His main conclusion was that 'the provision of a dubbed commentary can enhance students' perception of the structure of a lesson, which they have perceived by means of a televised recording' (p. 216).

Young and Young (1972) report that perceptual modelling ('a videotaped teaching episode which exaggerates a specific teaching behaviour') is more effective than symbolic modelling ('a detailed written description of a specific teaching behaviour'), but that a combination of the two is more effective than either alone.

2. Peer teaching versus real pupils

Users of microteaching often worry about the relative advantages and disadvantages of using peers or real pupils for microlessons. Nutthall (1972) used Minicourse 1 (Borg et al 1970) to test his hypothesis that there would be no difference in the development of teaching skills between student teachers who practised in a microteaching situation using pupils, and student teachers who practised using peers acting as pupils. He found no difference except in one skill, where the peer teaching group repeated pupils' answers less than the group teaching real pupils. We may suppose that similar results would be obtained if we repeated the research in an FL situation.

In fact the majority of FL teacher trainers use peers, not because of research findings but for pragmatic reasons. Cammish (1973) says that we must be careful

that children do not suffer in our attempt to provide something useful for our students. She tried 'voluntary labour' during school holidays but found that she could not rely on the children turning up. The subsequent change to peer teaching with role playing brought with it several advantages: microteaching was easier to organise; students learned from the simulation as well as from the teaching; highly satisfactory personal relations developed between peers; students were helped to gain confidence before being required to teach in a real classroom.

Beattie and Teather (1971) along with Johnstone (1977) point out the importance in language teaching of building on to what is already known. If real pupils are used the teacher has to know beforehand exactly what stage the pupils are at. This makes planning of microteaching very difficult.

In an Exploratory FL microteaching model peer-teaching is often felt to be less satisfactory. In a personal communication Whitaker says that he is 'wary of stressing the wrong things when there is no genuine interaction'. If discussion is to include questions such as 'What are the rest of the class doing while the teacher is talking to one pupil?' (Carver and Wallace 1977) it ought to real pupils. Cripwell (1979) points to the danger of role-playing by peers who may concentrate more on their performance than on the 'teacher'. This can be frustrating for the teacher, both during the lesson and when discussion focuses on aspects of 'pupil' behaviour that the teacher considers to have been unrealistic.

DeLorenzo (1975) finds that peers tend to be overly empathetic in their criticism of fellow students. He describes a microteaching programme in schools with real pupils and considers this an important intermediate stage between peer teaching and the real situation. Johnstone's Model 2 also uses pupils in a school setting (1977).

3. The tutor's presence during the microlesson

During the microlesson the tutor may or may not be present. I know of no relevant research but Cripwell (1979) describes how he leaves his students on their own while they are recording their microlessons. He feels this reduces their apprehension. It also gives them an opportunity to analyse and improve their performance and re-record it if they wish. Watching one of his groups I was impressed by the 'learning by discovery' that took place with all members of the group participating and helping.

4. Feedback

The feedback stage of microteaching has received a particularly large amount of attention. In FL microteaching the favourite feedback procedure is group discussion led by the tutor. Carver and Wallace (1977) give their reasons for favouring this procedure:

1. it seems to be the most efficient way of using student time;
2. it enables, hopefully, the whole group to benefit from the critique arising from any one example of microteaching ....;
3. it takes a lot of the tension out of the situation, in that remarks need not be directed specifically at the microteacher;
4. the presence of the tutor makes it possible to direct the discussion and to relate it to methodology tutorial classes.

This kind of feedback is often accompanied by a video-recording of the microlesson. Tutor control of the video playback is necessary. McAleese and Unwin (1971) refer to researchers at Stanford who feel that 'the most inefficient use of video tape is to replay the entire lesson during the assessment session. They suggest that sound and vision feedback is most effective when it is selective' (p. 17).

Wragg (1971) found that a combination of video feedback

and interaction analysis was more effective than either on its own. The effects of other sources and combinations of feedback have also been examined. However, Griffith's summary of research in this area is depressing:

> 'It can be seen that though the feedback stage of microteaching has received considerable research attention there are still very few consistent results. There certainly is evidence that mechanical recordings, tutors, peers and pupils can provide feedback which produces changes in teaching behaviour. Equally there are studies which demonstrate that such feedback can be ineffective. Currently we can only guess the conditions under which each source of feedback may or may not be valuable. As always we need more research' (Griffiths 1974, p. 20-21).

5. The reteach lesson

The reteach stage has received little research attention In practice it is frequently omitted because of shortage of time. It may also be left as an option which a student may or may not take up.

6. Students' attitudes

It hardly need be said that students' attitudes towards microteaching will affect what they learn from it. This means that although unfavourable student attitudes would not be sufficient reason to dismiss the technique, the reasons for the dissatisfaction would have to be carefully examined. It was for this reason that during the first years in which microteaching was used at Stirling University, evidence was collected on students' attitudes. These were generally favourable. Also, preferences expressed on most points (for example, the value of videotape playbacks in addition to tutors' or peers' comments) did not 'seem to run counter to other evidence or arguments about how microteaching can be made most effective, and can, therefore, in principle, provide a basis for planning microteaching programmes to optimise

their attractiveness to students' (McIntyre and Duthie 1977, O. 31). They also found however, that student preferences were always for the alternative that was more costly in terms of manpower and time.

Given the flexibility of microteaching procedures it would be difficult to generalise from the Stirling findings. However, they do remind us of the importance of collecting such evidence in the first years of any microteaching programme.

7. Alternative or supplementary techniques to microteaching

Brown (1975) outlines a model of teaching which was the basis of his microteaching programme at the University of Ulster. The teacher analyses his intention that pupils are to learn, plans appropriate actions and performs these actions. His perception of the changes that his performance effects on the pupils may alter his intentions and his subsequent performance. The central processes which shape his performance and perception are his linguistic skills, his cognitive abilities, his personality, his attitudes, and his role expectation of himself and of his pupils. His pupils' intentions will also modify his perception and performance.

From the model Brown extracts three constituents of a teacher training programme: planning, performance and perception. Overt training in perception is often omitted in microteaching programmes.

In two linked experiments Brown showed that six hours' training in pupil-teacher interaction analysis sharpened students' perceptions of teaching. Feedback, either conventional supervision or based upon teacher-pupil interaction, changed the students' performance but not their perception.

Few teacher trainers would dispute the importance of perception as an element in teaching. Brown's results are, therefore, interesting. Krumm (1973) describes

a training course model for German teachers of English which incorporates the training in both performance and perception recommended by Brown. His aim is to develop an interaction analysis system based on Flanders' multiple coding techniques and Nearhoof's category system (Nearhoof 1969). The Flint system developed by Moskovitz (1971) for foreign language teaching and based on Flanders' categories might also be used to sharpen students' perceptions. Allwright's (1977) analysis in terms of turns, topics and tasks is another interesting approach worth investigation.

The controlled nature of microteaching makes it an attractive setting for experimental research. Here we have touched on only very few of the large number of studies available (see, for example, Falus and McAleese 1975). It is all the more disappointing then to realise how difficult it is to generalise from these studies. The little insight that we can gain and apply to our use of microteaching in FL teacher training seems out of all proportion to the research effort. MacLeod and McIntyre (1977) suggest why: 'We researchers on microteaching have fallen into the same trap as did researchers in other fields, such as classroom teaching and programmed instruction, in that we have been premature in our concentration on the use of experimentation .... Experimental research is of crucial importance in testing hypotheses derived from coherent theories; but in the absence of such theories and hypotheses, experiments are almost certain to leave one as ignorant on their completion, whether one knows it or not, as one was when one started' (p. 254).

When microteaching was first developed at Stanford it was supported by behaviour modification theory (Bartley 1971). This was sufficient rationale for the basic methodological procedures of microteaching but it is not enough to offer much help in interpreting the research now available or to suggest new lines of research. MacLeod and McIntyre (op cit) offer an alternative rationale which they outline as follows:

1. Before entering microteaching programmes, each student has distinctive, complex, conceptual schemata relating to teaching, these schemata having strong evaluative associations.

2. Individual differences in these conceptual schemata are large, but large areas of commonality may also obtain, through the embedding of the schemata within (inter alia) a network of schemata representing specific subject ideologies.

3. These conceptual schemata show a high degree of stability, but can change gradually through the assimilation of new constructs and principles, acquired through instruction and experience.

4. Students' conceptual schemata to a large extent control their teaching behaviour, and changes in behaviour result from changes in schemata.

5. New concepts and ways of perceiving teaching are acquired largely as a result of instruction, but new principles and ways of evaluating teaching are acquired not only from instruction but also from students' perceptions of what actually occurs in their microteaching lessons; and where these two influences conflict, it is the latter which predominates.

6. Since the constucts in terms of which students will perceive their lessons are largely determined before they teach the lessons, the kinds of mechanical or descriptive feedback with which they are provided will have only little influence on the nature of their perceptions or, therefore, on their subsequent teaching behaviour.

7. Since students' explanations of the effects of teaching behaviours and consequently their evaluations of it, are influenced by what happens in their lessons, the interpretations and judgements of others on lessons they have taught, and the alternatives they offer, are

potentially influential factors in students' learning.

This interpretation implies that in microteaching we must take account of individual differences between students and differences between subject ideologies. It also suggests that the type of feedback a student is given is important. Descriptive feedback given for example by a videorecording is not enough. Feedback must involve his own and others' perceptions and interpretations of what happened in the lesson.

As MacLeod and McIntyre point out, the value and validity of their interpretation must now be tested by research. Any other research should follow their advice: 'In the long run, it is a far more economic research strategy to use looser and more exploratory designs in the hope that from their results we shall have the insight to be able to begin the development of theoretical ideas' (p. 254).

Where does all this leave the FL teacher trainer who is currently using microteaching? He may modify his approach by using bits and pieces of research such as I have indicated in this section, but he will continue to be guided principally by his own experience and the experience and attitudes of colleagues.

4. THE STRENGTHS OF MICROTEACHING AS PERCEIVED BY FL USERS

An impression of attitudes of students and their tutors to microteaching is of course influenced by the fact that those who have reported on their experience have been generally motivated to do so by their positive attitude. However, even those whose experience is less positive and who have remained silent must have tried microteaching because they felt attracted by its potential. The positive experience of others may encourage them to modify their approach.

1. The most frequent comment by users (both students and tutors) is that microteaching provides an important practical element in the teacher training course and a link between theoretical components and experience in real classrooms. Particularly in the exploratory model it can be used as a context for the discussion of certain crucial language teaching issues (Bartley 1971; Johnstone 1977; Jorstad 1973). Beattie and Teather (1971) comment that the particularity and immediacy of the situation seem to provoke greater detail and realism in discussion.

2. The 'micro' approach (particularly in the skills-analysis model) encourages both tutors and students to examine in great detail exactly what happens in a particular area of teaching (Carver and Wallace 1975). This should also help towards establishing criteria for teaching behaviour.

3. The 'micro' approach forces students to plan with discipline (Johnstone 1977).

4. Microteaching is a 'low risk' situation in which students can find success before teaching in a real classroom. This decreases their anxiety towards teaching practice (Bartley 1971; Jorstad 1973; Wolfe 1971).

5. Immediate feedback is possible. The benefit of this is supported by behaviour modification theory (Bartley 1971).

6. Feedback with the help of videorecordings contributes to students' self-awareness (Paulston 1974). (But see MacLeod (1977) who suggests that 'the effects of both video- and skill-related feedback are perhaps less potent than has been assumed' (p. 211)).

7. Videorecordings provide a common frame of reference for the student and his tutor, and are trusted for their apparent objectivity (Cammish 1973). (Students and tutors often seem to ignore that this objectivity is

relative: the camera has only one eye and has to select what to look at).

8. Microteaching using peers allows students to view and discuss each others' lessons and so learn from each other. Given modern integrated disciplinary approaches and team teaching Cammish (1973) feels that this is also valuable as an exercise in working together.

5. AREA FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

There is no doubt that microteaching is a promising medium for FL teacher training. However, many issues remain unresolved and require further investigation.

Crucial to the whole question of microteaching is the problem of skills analysis. We need to:

1. identify the skills required for effective teaching of particular subject matter;
2. establish the extent to which skills practised in a microteaching setting carry over appropriately and effectively into the FL classroom both in the short term and the long term.

Several users of microteaching have pointed out that not all students need the same practice, or the same amount of practice. This suggests that students' weaknesses should be diagnosed before microteaching practice and the microteaching programme designed accordingly. Since microteaching practice on most pre-service courses precedes school teaching practice, the practical problems of diagnosis virtually preclude the possibility of tailoring microteaching programmes to individual's needs.

However, we need to:

3. investigate how microteaching could best be used for remedial practice. This might involve the

preparation of mini-courses which could be used for individual self-instruction or for group work on in-service courses.

At Stanford 'microclass' practice was developed as an intermediate stage between the microlesson and school experience (Allen and Ryan 1969). Altman and Ramirez (1971) discuss the microclass in an FL training context. The need to develop a practice programme that moves gradually from a specific form of microteaching to classroom teaching has been recognised by several other teacher trainers. Stirling University is working towards such a programme: 'These bridging experiences require far more attention with closer specification and definition of such experiences in a more carefully graded progression than prevails at present' (Lloyd 1977, p. 251). Following the guidelines of Stirling University and of Beattie and Teather (1971) and Carver and Wallace (1977) we need to:

4. establish a taxonomy of approaches to microteaching in FL teacher training.

We have already discussed the importance of developing students' perceptive skills. We need to:

5. develop or test existing tools of analysis and establish their effectiveness as a supplement or alternative to microteaching practice.

Research does not happen overnight. While it is being done, FL teacher trainers need to continue to share their experiences and insights.

Marion Geddes
British Council
February 1978

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, D and FORTUNE, J (1966)

'An analysis in microteaching: new procedures in teacher education'. Microteaching: A description, School of Education, Stanford University.

ALLEN, D and RYAN, K (1969)

Microteaching. Addison-Wesley.

ALLWRIGHT, R L (1977)

'Turns, topics, and tasks: patterns of participation in language learning and teaching'. Paper delivered at TESOL National Convention, Florida.

ALTMAN, H B and RAMIREZ, A G (1971)

'Beyond microteaching: some first steps in individualising pre-service training for foreign language teachers'. Modern Language Journal Vol 55, No 5, p. 276-80.

APPLEBEE, A N (1976)

'Microteaching, component skills and the training of teachers: an evaluation of a research and development project'. British Journal of Educational Technology Vol 7, No 2, p. 35-44.

BARTLEY, D E (1971)

'Microteaching: rationale, procedures and application to foreign language'. Audio-Visual Language Journal Vol 9, No 3, p. 139-44.

BEATTIE, N M and TEATHER, D C B (1971)

'Microteaching in the training of teachers of modern languages: some preliminary comments'. Audio-Visual Language Journal Vol 9, No 3, p. 117-21.

BORG, W R, KELLEY, M L, LANGER, P and GALL, M D (1970)

The minicourse: a microteaching approach to teacher education. Collier Macmillan.

BROWN, G (1975)

Microteaching: a programme of teaching skills. Methuen.

BRUSLING, C (1974)

Microteaching: a concept in development. Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences 12. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

CAMMISH, N K (1973)

'Videotapes and teaching technique'. Modern Languages Vol 54, No 1, p. 8-14.

CARVER, D and WALLACE, M (1975)

'Some applications of microteaching to TESL'. English Language Teaching Journal Vol 29, No 3, p. 184-90.

CARVER, D and WALLACE, M (1977)

'Models of microteaching in the training of language teachers'. Mimeo. Scottish Centre for Education Overseas, Moray House, Edinburgh. 5 pages.

CRIPWELL, K (1979)

'Microteaching in the training of teachers of English as a second or foreign language'. In Occasional papers 1: Microteaching and EFL teacher education. EFL department, Institute of Education, University of London.

DeLORENZO, W E (1975)

'Microteaching as a transitional technique to student teaching'. Foreign Language Annals Vol 8, No 3, p. 239-45.

DUNKIN, M J and BIDDLE, B J (1974)

The study of teaching. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

FALUS, I and McALEESE, W R (1975)

'A bibliography of microteaching'. Programmed Learning and Educational Technology Vol 13, No 1, p. 34-53.

GEDDES, M and RAZ, H (1979)

'Studying pupil-teacher interaction in a microteaching setting: an experiment in structured role-play. In HOLDEN, S (ed.) Teacher Training, Modern English Publications.

GIBB, G O (1968)

'Account of an experiment designed to test the effectiveness of a commentary superimposed over a televised lesson'. Educational Review Vol 20, No 3, p. 204-217.

GILMORE, S (1977)

'The effects of positive and negative models on student teachers' questioning behaviours'. In McIntyre, D et al (eds.), Investigations of microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

30

GRIFFITHS, R (1974)

'The contribution of feedback to microteaching technique'. In Trott, A J (ed.), Microteaching Conference Papers, APLET Occasional Publications No 3, p. 15-22.

JOHNSTONE, R (1977)

'Microteaching and modern languages'. In McIntyre, D et al (eds.), Investigations of Microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

JORSTAD, H (1973)

'Training prospective foreign language teachers at the University of Minnesota'. Foreign Language Annals Vol 6, No 4, p. 521-23.

KALLENBACK, W W and GALL, M D (1969)

'Microteaching versus conventional methods in training elementary intern teachers'. Journal of Educational Research Vol 63, No 3, p. 136-41.

KRUMM, H-J (1973)

'Interaction analysis and microteaching for the training of modern language teachers'. IRAL Vol 11, No 2, p. 163-70.

LLOYD, J M (1977)

'Microteaching and the preparation of history teachers: some reflections'. In McIntyre, D et al (eds.), Investigations of Microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

MacLEOD, G (1977)

'The effects of videotape- and skills-related feedback on students' perceptions of their microteaching performance'. In McIntyre, D et al (eds.), Investigations of Microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

MacLEOD, G and McINTYRE, D (1977)

'Towards a model for microteaching'. In McIntyre, D et al (eds.), Investigations of microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

McALEESE, W R and UNWIN, D (1971)

'A selective survey of microteaching'. Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, Vol 8, No 1, p. 10-21.

McINTYRE, D and DUTHIE, J (1977)

'Students' reactions to microteaching'. In McIntyre, D et al (eds.), Investigations of microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

31

McINTYRE, D, MacLEOD, G and GRIFFITHS, (1977)

Investigations of microteaching. London: Croom Helm.

MOSKOVITZ, G (1971)

'Interaction analysis: a new modern language for supervisors'. Foreign Language Annals Vol 5, No 2, p. 211-21.

NEARHOOF, O (1973)

'Teacher-pupil interaction in a foreign language classroom: a technique for self-evaluation'. Unpublished research paper quoted from Krumm, H-J. 'Interaction analysis and microteaching for the training of modern language teachers'. IRAL Vol 11, No 2, p. 163-70.

NUTHALL, G (1972)

'A comparison of the use of microteaching with two types of pupils - 10 year old pupils and peers acting as pupils'. Paper presented at the International Microteaching Symposium, Tubingen, W Germany.

PAULSTON, C B (1974)

'Using videotape at Pittsburgh'. English Teaching Forum Vol 12, No 4, p. 57-60.

POLITZER, R (1967)

Performance criteria for the foreign language teacher. Technical Report No 1A. Stanford Centre for Research and Development in Training.

POLITZER, R (1969)

'Microteaching: a new approach to teacher training and research'. Hispania Vol 52, No 2, p. 244-8.

STONES, E and MORRIS, S (1972)

Teaching practice: problems and perspectives. Methuen.

WOLFE, D E (1971)

'The direct experiences of microteaching and team teaching in FL teacher education'. Foreign Language Annals Vol 5, No 2, p. 226-34.

WRAGG, E C (1971)

'The influence of feedback on teachers' performance'. Educational Research Vol 13, No 3, p. 218-21.

YORKE, D M (1977)

'Television in the education of teachers: a case-study'. British Journal of Educational Technology Vol 8, No 2, p. 131-141.

YOUNG, D B (1969)

'Modification of teacher behaviour using audio, video-taped models in microteaching sequence'. Educational Leadership Vol 26, p. 394-403.

YOUNG, D B and YOUNG, D A (1972)

'The model in use (microteaching)'. In Stones, E and Morris, S (eds.), Teaching practice: problems and perspectives. Methuen.

ED224428

A SEVEN-DAY MICROTEACHING PROGRAMME

FOR EFL TEACHERS

C.J. Brumfit

University of London
Institute of Education

FL013110

In this short paper I want to describe the procedures which I have developed for microteaching with students on the Postgraduate Certificate in Education during a short, intensive period which is set aside for microteaching work. Each tutor works in his own way with groups of about 15 students, all of whom have at least two years of teaching experience before coming on the course.

Many over-strong claims have been made for the value of microteaching. I would like to make limited claims for it on the following bases:

i) by peer teaching in a micro-situation we are able to isolate certain aspects of the teaching situation from the presence of genuine students; thus certain techniques and abilities can be concentrated on in a comparatively pure form;

ii) we are provided with as live as possible a context for the discussion of teaching problems (real students would be unfair on the students, for they will always have to be bribed to come, and no microteaching situation provides genuine <u>teaching</u>, but not to peer teach would mean that all discussion would be based on at best video-taped situations which had not been experienced live);

iii) those who are 'taught' have the experience of being in the pupil situation and - if they can suspend disbelief - can sense some of the difficulties of that position;

iv) some techniques for classroom observation and analysis can be practised without the inconvenience of going to a school;

v) most important, we can prepare and discuss teaching in small groups, co-operatively, with a very close relationship between the practice being observed and the discussion and preparation, both in time and the people involved.

These claims do not involve any suggestion of using the technique as a way of 'correcting' or 'improving' specific skills, although it is possible that such results may come as spin-off. The emphasis here is on the microteaching as a source for discussion and analysis, with the general aim of sensitising students to the process of integrating practical decisions with systematic and principled thinking about both specific teaching demands and general educational theory.

Students microteach from 0930 - 1300 every day. The afternoons and evenings are spent in preparation. As a run-in to the formal microteaching sessions there should have been a great deal of informal small-group practising of specific techniques in the course of normal methods classes. This will have happened twice weekly for the first part of the term - the microteaching takes place towards the end of the first term. The only other formal preparation is a lecture, accompanied by a handout, on some procedures for analysing classroom activity.

The sessions are conducted in order to cover a variety of different procedures, using a framework which gives some cohesion but which allows each group to determine its own needs and strategies to a certain extent. The basic programme is as follows:

Days 1 and 2: All fifteen students teach one individual 'lesson', each of four to five minutes. These are videotaped and played back, either one at a time or in groups of three or four. There is only time for a fairly short discussion after each one, but every student sees himself on videotape.

Days 3 and 4: All fifteen students teach another microlesson. These will probably be videotaped and played back but the play-back will be selective and students can opt out of being recorded at all. There is much more time for discussion as a result and re-teaching by the original teacher or by others occurs more frequently. Often the choice of topics for Days 3 and 4 arises directly from discussions on the first two days and groups of students may decide all to approach the same problem from various directions. During these two days fruitful collaboration often develops in the preparation.

Days 5 and 6: Students are divided into five groups of three and each group has to prepare a twenty-minute extract from a lesson. This may be taught in a variety of ways. One student may teach it; more frequently it will be taught by all three, either concurrently or as three separate units and occasionally one student will teach it but will set up the other two to sit in as pupils with everyone else and to offer specific kinds of support. Discussion from these lessons may be extensive: often more than an hour. It will concentrate on choices made during the lesson. Questions relating to alternative modes of presentation, timing of parts of the lesson and techniques for dealing with particular problems will arise. Where discussion on the first four days will be limited, by the concentration imposed by the time restriction, to matters of technique, discussion of the twenty minute lessons will be much more open-ended. Directing this discussion so that it is not too diffuse but not too tutor-centred is extremely difficult.

Day 7: Students will themselves determine the best way of ending the microteaching period. Often they will wish to repeat the format of some of the earlier days. I usually insist that at some stage they play an 'improvising' game, in which each student has to draw a task out of a hat and immediately teach as instructed, without time to think. Tasks may be: drill

rapidly to sensitise pupils to a /v/-/w/ confusion which has come up; improvise a mime to put life into a class which threatens to collapse into sleep; you have been asked the meaning of 'threatening' - do anything (except define it) to enable the class to understand its meaning. This activity is fun and helps to reduce tension at the end of a very concentrated period of intensive work.

Types of task: For the short lessons, students are asked to choose from a list of settings originally compiled by Dr Geoffrey Broughton, of which an example is given below:

Situation 11:
Learners: 14-year old mixed intermediate.
Previous knowledge: three years of English.
Aim: To revise and practise Type 1 conditionals, direct and reported.
Use: Blackboard story, taped drill, substitution tables, written work.

They are asked to decide whether they are working within the presentation, drilling, controlled practice or free practice part of a unit, and to use a four or five minute extract of the lesson. If they feel unhappy with the situations presented (there are 18 in all), they are free to specify their own, using the same format. The tasks for the longer lessons may follow the same basic list, or may be constructed as a result of earlier discussion on the first few days. Sometimes it seems appropriate for a number of students to attempt the same, or related tasks, but no rigid pattern is followed.

Pattern for a particular lesson:
There will be four sets of students in any particular lesson: from one to three teaching, from one to three making formal observations at the back of the class, probably one working the camera and the remainder acting as 'pupils'. Normally these roles rotate, at least in the first four days, so that the person who has just taught will operate the camera in the next lesson, become a pupil the next, and

possibly observe the next. Students are asked to specify before they teach not only the task, level and type of class and so on, but also what types of observation they would particularly like checked. The lesson is then taught, possibly played back and the teacher is given first chance to speak. Discussion then follows, as much as there is time for, or as is judged necessary and, at an appropriate moment, the observers are asked to produce their statistics. In practice, fruitful discussion rarely finishes in less than four times the length of the lesson and can often go on a great deal longer, especially if demonstration and re-teaching is included. Quite often subsequent lessons by the same or other students will directly spring out of the discussion of a particular lesson.

Problems and comments:

a) The teacher. Most people are very nervous at first, although a lot depends on the group rapport and supportiveness. It certainly helps for it to be known that everyone has to go through the experience, but all teachers are relieved when the first lesson has been completed. Apart from nervousness, the major problem at first is understanding that a four minute lesson is a four minute extract, not a forty minute lesson condensed into four minutes, nor, of course, a four minute talk about a lesson. Discussion of basic preparation becomes crucial here (but I have avoided showing tapes of microteaching after one disastrous experience when everyone followed the videotapes slavishly after they had been shown).

b) The class. There are various possibilities for class behaviour. I have often found simulation of pupil behaviour very effective but there is always the risk of the student who is insensitive ruining everything with inappropriate responses. In general, I recommend a fairly deadpan approach, simply serving the ball back on the first two days, but allow increasing simulation to be

introduced gently from then on. It helps here if the teacher sits in with the groups as a pupil so that the situation does not explode as everyone giggles helplessly - or at least does that less often than it might.

c) The camera operator. Not everyone wants to operate the camera, but most people appreciate the opportunity. The most important technique to learn is not to move or zoom too rapidly. This is pretty soon picked up, but first attempts at camera movement usually result in rather jerky recording.

d) The observers. I usually have one observer for each lesson using the Flanders system, simply because it is much talked about, so that it is useful for people to see how it works. The other one or two either follow the suggestions of the teachers, who want particular features looked at, or their own or my suggestions as we hear what kind of lesson is going to be taught. Sometimes grids are drawn to show direction and number of questions, sometimes careful timing of phases in the lesson, sometimes counts of number of appropriate responses from individual pupils, and so on. Later in the week we may even experiment with less objective procedures, such as grading the lesson on a warm-cold, five-point scale. Decisions to use particular observation techniques depend on an understanding of what sort of information the teacher will happily respond to, as well as matters of efficiency. Altogether, the observers contribute usefully to discussion, as well as enabling us to consider the worth of particular procedures. Later, during the full teaching practice in Spain, students will observe each other teach and they frequently, voluntarily, produce statistics from observation for their own informal discussions.

e) The role of the tutor. I always take part as a pupil and sometimes teach a lesson. At the beginning I lead the discussion but later I will take a much less dominant role, occasionally not even contributing at all, perhaps leaving the group altogether for some discussion. The microteaching period is extremely intensive and can become too tutor-centred, especially when everyone is nervous at the beginning. However, students usually expect me to take a fairly dominant role and I frequently have more difficulty avoiding responsibility than acquiring it. Particularly, students often want to know whether a particular approach is absolutely satisfactory and have to be told that nothing is absolutely so - it will always depend on who is teaching whom and where they are. That is, microteaching can help to do certain things but it cannot set up patterns which can then be applied uncritically to any outside situation.

There is one problem which is worth mentioning because I have not been able to solve it. If the tutor has a model of what good teaching is and imposes it, he breeds confidence, but he is also starting not from a view of where students are, but of where they ought to be. If the tutor says, in effect, 'show me what you can do and I will suggest ways of improving it, without stopping you from being you, building on what you have done,' then the tutor will appear to be using a deficit model of teaching because he will be making suggestions for improvement which imply criticism, without being able to say 'yes, your good points were close to my model' - because he has not got that sort of model. This difficulty applies mainly to teaching practice but it arises in microteaching even if the intention is not to improve, because students do want to be praised and commented upon by the end of the period, if not at the beginning.

At the moment I attain an uneasy and unsatisfactory compromise between student-centred improvement comment and praise about which I feel guilty. My difficulty is that in microteaching I cannot tell whether anything is good teaching - that will depend on the relationship achieved with the class; I can praise good technique but such praise is rather limited in value as it is a necessary but not sufficient attainment; I can tell that some things are bad teaching, so I risk appearing negative. This is a problem which I do discuss with students and, indeed, I have had no microteaching group which has not had one session voluntarily discussing the whole problem of teacher training.

I hope in this brief description to have shown one way of approaching a microteaching slot in an EFL teacher training programme. My aim has been to be both flexible and principled. Only students can tell whether I ever succeed.

ED224282

MICROTEACHING IN THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND OR FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Kenneth R. Cripwell

University of London
Institute of Education

FL013111

I have used microteaching as a part of teacher training for the past thirteen years. Each time I have included microteaching in the programme there have been some variations. I have used it with both real students and with peers; I have used it in classrooms and in training institutions; I have used it as part of a team teaching exercise as well as for individual five minute exercises.

However, over the last five or six years a pattern has emerged which I think is effective and which the students have also approved not only immediately after completion of the exercise but also a year or so after they have started teaching.

The first essential, in my opinion, is that the microteaching should be clearly established as a preparation for teaching. Student teachers should understand that it is not teaching but that it is an exercise in the development of teaching skills necessary in the classroom. I find that any suggestion that the exercise is based on any element of pretence results in a rather destructive cynicism. I believe that the link between microteaching and practice teaching in a school should be as close as is possible in the circumstances.

In order to establish the link between microteaching and practice teaching I believe student teachers need to watch a teacher in a classroom. They need to be briefed before the observation to look for specific skills. For example, they could be asked to observe and record how the classroom teacher contextualises a particular chunk of language. This observation then can form the basis for the microteaching.

In the University of London Institute of Education all students who are being trained as teachers of English as a second or foreign language have had at least two years' teaching abroad or teaching foreign students in Britain. Some also have had training such as the four-week course at International House. For them it does not seem as important to observe practising teachers as it would where

students have had no real teaching experience. In any case the arrangements for linked observation in London would be almost impossible to organise and perhaps what is being done is the result of necessity rather than conviction!

In our case the students are presumed to know and to have operated foreign language teaching skills. In any case, as part of the theoretical course they will have seen and discussed demonstrations - on film and tape - of foreign language teaching. They can, therefore, start directly with an assignment each. I try, in the two-week period, to cover the following assignments for each of the 15 students in the group:

1. The presentation of 10 lexical items in a set
2. The presentation of a structure
3. The presentation and drilling of a structure

The microteaching runs over a period of eight days, morning and afternoon. This yields something like 22 sessions of about two hours each. The sessions are allocated on the following basis:

	MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.	MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.
1	Briefing	G2	General discussion	G3	Trust games	G3	G2	General playback
2	Observation film/ tape	G3	G1	G4	G1	G4	G3	General playback
3	Group 1	G4	G2	General playback	G2	G1	G4	

Before the students start they need a short session learning how to operate the camera and recording equipment. This essential training takes place in the first group sessions. It is important that they learn to operate the equipment rather than technicians as this reduces their apprehension; outsiders only help to make them feel ill at ease. It is

for this reason also that I try not to be present during recording sessions, apart from showing them how to use the equipment. I tell them that when they are ready for me to see their recordings they are to call me. This also lets me off being present for all the sessions when I have other work to do with other students. It also prevents the students from directing their lessons at me and my having to present at all times the bright, smiling and approving face which can be so hard on the face muscles.

Once each student in the group has presented his exercise and the group has reviewed what has been recorded, there should be an opportunity for re-recording before calling the tutor for discussion. In this way the student teacher learns to analyse and improve his own performance. After the tutorial discussions, which should take place only with the members of the group, there should be an opportunity for a further re-recording, but time often prevents this.

After each student has completed his assignment there is a general playback session when the work of all members of the group is discussed by the tutor. At the end of these sessions the tapes are wiped or re-used.

A number of problems have arisen with microteaching in my experience which may need to be considered by other teacher educators using this treatment.

I limit any micro-lesson to five minutes. Inevitably students run over but in no case do I allow more than ten minutes. The reason for this is time. I find that it takes about 50 minutes to discuss a five-minute micro-lesson; ten minutes can take almost two hours! Also, with replay and re-recording longer lessons often mean that some lessons are skimped in discussions which students dislike intensely.

Some teacher educators like to use the other members of the group as pupils. Personally, I have not found simulation very effective. Student teachers seem to understand the artificial nature of microteaching and the benefits to be gained from laboratory conditions to develop specific skills.

They seem to find the additional artificiality of role-playing in a simulation exercise difficult to accept. Unless the role-playing is carefully structured the 'pupils' tend to concentrate on their performances rather than on what their 'teacher' is doing. This can become most frustrating for both teacher and taught. The fact that the peers, who are acting as pupils, are as competent as the teacher does not help either in terms of the micro-teaching or in terms of simulation.

However, I have now introduced an exercise which is real in that learning can be observed to be taking place or not. I require the students to teach the 10 lexical items in an exotic language unknown to the rest of the sub-group. From our experiences it is clear that in a five-minute session it is impossible to teach more than three or four lexical items. This realism at the beginning of the microteaching is extremely useful in demonstrating to the students the principles of teaching in relation to lexical items.

Student teachers are extremely sensitive to almost any form of observation - either by tutors or peers. In micro-teaching their fears can prove destructive. It is important, in my experience, to develop a trust and confidence among all members of the group, including the tutor. It is for this reason that I spend at least two sessions working through a number of trust games. Trust and confidence is important in any form of group work and these exercises serve not only to demonstrate the principles and confidence in the developed and used in the tutorial group. Normally, after the trust games, exercises which have been worked through the microteaching sessions seem to go much more smoothly and co-operatively. In fact, past students always ask about the trust game element in the microteaching and warn me constantly that they were an essential factor in the success or failure of their microteaching sessions.

This fear of observation is also seen in the students' attitude to recordings. There is always a feeling of relief when the first set of exercises are erased or the tape is used for new recordings. The videotape recordings

should not be used as evidence of good or bad teaching. If students have a feeling that they will be judged on their practice microteaching they seem either to want to reject the whole idea of microteaching or they turn the exercise into a 'performance'. A performance can be dangerous: some students will then try to copy or 'top' the performance and others will refuse to compete. Either reaction can destroy the usefulness of the microteaching exercise.

Connected to this idea of 'performance' is the idea of 'the perfect lesson'. Many students seem to think that there is one golden lesson which with the help of the tutor he will be able to distill and use in the classroom at some future date. The recordings, particularly of micro-lessons taught in previous years at the end of the two-week session, can sometimes establish a pattern from which it may be difficult to move. For instance, one year the group became extremely interested in the use of blackboard drawings in chalk combined with cut-out illustrations attached to the board with Blutak. I showed some of the exercises the following year in the briefing session and it was not long before every student was using the same technique. This year I have changed the order and show exercises from previous years only after the group has recorded a number of micro-lessons themselves. I feel that then they want on their own terms from recordings made by students they have probably never met.

However, it is sometimes useful to show a good example of foreign language teaching at the start of the exercise. I have found the film - Teaching English in Primary Schools in Hong Kong - made by the Department of Education in Hong Kong extremely useful. It is sufficiently removed from most students' experience so that they are able to view it in a more detached way than is possible with recordings made by their predecessors.

I normally ask students for permission to retain the recordings of their final micro-lessons to show future students. If any student has reservations the tape is wiped. Students who

agree to allow me to retain recordings are also asked under what circumstances their recordings can be used. Usually replaying of recordings is limited by students to occasions when either the student or the tutor or tutors in the Department is present. This is entirely reasonable in my view as uninhibited showings of video-tape recordings could prove extremely embarassing in future years.

It has been interesting to note that in recent years students have begun to ask for more opportunities to record micro-lessons. Some students have asked about the use of the videotape recorders, which nowadays can be extremely portable, to record sections or modules of their lessons in classrooms during their practice teaching. Up to the present the logistics have prevented developments but we hope to experiment next year.

In addition, students have asked for further microteaching to take place in the Summer Term after they have completed all their classroom teaching practice. They believe that microteaching could help them to develop their skills still further before they complete their course of training and start teaching in earnest.

In conclusion, microteaching, like many aspects of teacher education, varies considerably from one situation to another. I have found it a most useful method of developing student teaching skills in the way I have described. I believe that microteaching - either in this form or in other forms - could help considerably in the training of English teachers for the Norwegian educational system.

PROGRAMME

14 December 1978

0930 - 1000	Registration
1000 - 1100	Session One. A viewing of a recording made of microteaching at the Institute of Education during the previous week with a group of PGCE students.
1100 - 1130	Coffee
1130 - 1200	Session Two. A viewing of a second recording made of microteaching at the Institute of Education during the previous week with PGCE students.
1200 - 1300	A general discussion with some of the students who took part in the recordings.
1300 - 1400	Lunch
1400 - 1600	Individual exercises. The workshop broke into four groups and were required to record themselves presenting one of two tasks Both these tasks were selected from among those submitted in answer to a questionnaire sent out prior to the workshop.
1600 - 1615	Tea
1615 - 1700	Discussion
1700 - 1720	Film: Teaching ESL in the Primary School in Hong Kong. (Department of Education, Hong Kong).
1730	Sherry

15 December 1978

1000 - 1100	Film: Microteaching (British Council) Discussion of film.
1100 - 1130	Coffee
1130 - 1300	Objectives and tasks. Group discussion
1300 - 1400	Lunch
1400 - 1500	Group discussion
1500 - 1600	Plenary Session

INDIVIDUAL EXERCISES

1. Get pupils to build a short dialogue, suggested by one or more of the pictures provided. (Adult intermediate level)

2. Use one of the following texts as a basis for getting pupils to identify the discourse function/register of it.

common enemy is always trying to bring this about, and, of course, in bad luck a lot of things happen which play into the enemy's hands. We must just make the best of things as they come along.

Here in London, which Herr Hitler says he will reduce to ashes, and which his aeroplanes are now bombarding, our people are bearing up unflinchingly. Our Air Force has more than held its own. We are waiting for the long-promised invasion. So are the fishes. But, of course, this for us is only the beginning. Now in 1940, in spite of occasional losses, we have, as ever, command of the seas. In 1941 we shall have the command of the air. Remember what that means. Herr Hitler with his tanks and other mechanical weapons, and also by Fifth Column intrigue with traitors, has managed to subjugate for the time being most of the finest races in Europe, and his little Italian accomplice is trotting along hopefully and hungrily, but rather wearily and very timidly, at his side. They both wish to carve up France and her Empire as if it were a fowl: to one a leg, to another a wing or perhaps part of the breast. Not only the French Empire will be devoured by these two ugly customers, but Alsace-Lorraine will go once again under the German yoke, and Nice, Savoy and Corsica —Napoleon's Corsica—will be torn from the fair realm of France. But Herr Hitler is not thinking only of stealing other people's territories, or flinging gobbets of them to his little confederate. I tell you truly what you must believe when I say this evil man, this monstrous abortion of hatred and defeat, is resolved on nothing less than the complete wiping out of the French nation, and the disintegration of its whole life and future. By all kinds of sly and savage means, he is plotting and working to quench for ever the fountain of characteristic French culture and of French inspiration to the world. All Europe, if he has his way, will be reduced to one uniform Boche-land, to be exploited, pillaged, and bullied by his Nazi gangsters. You will excuse my speaking frankly because this is not a time to mince words. It is not defeat that France will now be made to suffer at German hands, but the doom of complete obliteration. Army, Navy, Air Force, religion, law, language, culture, institutions, literature, history, tradition, all are to be effaced by the brute strength of a triumphant army and the scientific low-cunning of a ruthless police force.

To the French People, a broadcast by Winston Churchill

d. To witness the disease of any human understanding, how-

Unit 7

SEA AND ISLANDS

In Unit 3 you read an extract from a book by Hammond Innes. He is a frequent traveller seeking out and visiting interesting places and people. Usually he sails his own boat when he travels by sea and, in this reading passage, he tells us the name of his boat. The passage is from one of Hammond Innes' travel books entitled *Sea and Islands*. In it, he tells of visits to many places, amongst them the Maritime States of Canada. He went to Nova Scotia, visiting a small island called Oak Island where a man called Bob Restall was digging for treasure. This reminded him of another treasure.

Oak Island is to my mind one of the two great treasure stories of the world. The other is Cocos Island. They are fundamentally opposites. In the case of the Cocos Island treasure everybody knows what is supposed to be buried there—all the wealth of the great cathedral built by the Conquistadors on Lima's Plaza de Armas, including two life-size statues in solid gold. It was consigned to Spain in the Bristol brigantine, *Mary Dier* (after which my own boat is named). The captain was a man named Thompson and once out in the Pacific he is supposed to have dropped the Jesuit priests who accompanied the treasure overboard and sailed for Cocos Island, which is a wet hell of a place bedevilled by landslides. What is not known is the exact location of the treasure and an element of mystery surrounds Keating, the Newfoundland fisherman (or was he Nova Scotian?) who mounted the first three expeditions little more than a century ago.

Where the Oak Island treasure differs is that there has never been any doubt about its location. Anybody with a few dollars to spare could hire a boat and go across to the island and watch Restall at work and stare down into the Money Pit as it is called. Six hundred tourists had been that year. But what is at the bottom of the Pit nobody knows. The popular theory is that Captain Kidd buried his ill-gotten gains there—an obvious choice, since pirates and treasure go together. More sophisticated theorists talk of Inca gold, even French state papers. Whatever it is, the fascination of Oak Island's Money Pit is that with all the modern techniques at their disposal, the treasure seekers—and there have been almost a dozen individuals or groups who between them have spent something like $1½ million—have all failed to get to the bottom of it. The secret is locked—locked in by water.

from *Sea and Islands*, Fontana 1970,
by Hammond Innes

Useful Words and Phrases

Fundamentally. Make sure you find this word in your dictionary. You will need to know its meaning for a later phrase.

Conquistadors. This is the name for Spanish conquerors

MICROTEACHING WORKSHOP/SEMINAR

Friday 15 December: Group discussions

Participants divided into small groups to discuss objectives and tasks in microteaching. To start the ball rolling and to help focus the discussion, 3 questions were raised:

1. What do we mean by 'skills' and 'techniques'?
2. Which skills/techniques can be usefully practised in microteaching?
3. What tasks could be set to practise any of these skills/techniques in a microteaching context?

Reports from each group are presented below:

Group 1

We agreed that it was difficult to define the terms 'skills' and 'techniques' satisfactorily and classify what teachers do to achieve an objective, by reference to these two terms. One solution to the problem of definition was to regard as 'techniques' the various devices that a teacher uses to achieve his objective, and regard as 'skill' the degree of appropriateness and success in using them. Thus, a substitution drill is a technique and it can be handled by a teacher with varying degrees of success of appropriateness ('skill'). We noted however, that we were now using the term as an uncountable noun and not as originally proposed.

In the course of discussion, the term 'macro-technique' was coined to refer to a range of similar techniques. The most obvious example was the 'macro-technique' drill; the various modes of conducting drill were then regarded as 'techniques' proper (or even as 'micro-techniques'), e.g. the type of drill (imitation/substitution/etc.), the variation of stimulus (verbal/non-verbal, written/spoken, etc.) and of response (.....).

Techniques were considered in terms of presentation, practice and production. Certain techniques might function at one stage, others at more than one stage.

Other 'macro-techniques' we considered were blackboard use, role-playing and management of activities.

The importance of establishing a good teacher/class rapport was emphasised and some suggestions as to how this might be amenable to microteaching were offered, e.g. noting the way a teacher entered a room full of strangers. We did not feel convinced however, that microteaching offered a satisfactory means of encouraging such rapport as it did in encouraging a review of the way teachers handle techniques.

Paul Tench, UWIST

Group 2

actual teaching situation (e.g. teaching practice)

general teaching skills		language teaching skills	
personal (management, control, questioning, projection variation ...)	technical (using the tools of the trade)	procedural techniques (e.g. choral repetition, drilling)	selection, organisation & control of language to be taught
		remedial	remedial

integrative
(student centred)
(i.e. what to do, when, how & with whom)

The group put forward the above diagram as a model for organising microteaching with reference to a specific objective which is outside the microteaching situation - here an actual teaching situation, probably a teaching practice

in a school. One common objection to microteaching is that it is artificial, but this objection is valid only if microteaching is seen as an end in itself. Where it is seen as a preparatory stage in a progressive sequence leading to full competence in the classroom it is more likely to gain acceptance and, therefore, to be a profitable experience for the students participating in it.

In the model an actual (real) teaching situation is set up as the objective towards which microteaching is leading. Two main skill areas are identified: general teaching skills and language teaching skills. It is conceivable that the two areas could be dealt with separately (e.g. in two different departments of the training institution) although there will clearly be grey areas of overlap.

In the area of language teaching skills a number of alternative 'routes' are available, as shown by the arrows. Students could go straight to an integrative student-centred type of microteaching in which the student is required to integrate a number of techniques and make decisions based on his own judgement concerning what he teaches, how he teaches it, in what order and so on. An approach of this kind, more suitable in in-service rather than initial training situations, will also have a diagnostic value in throwing up areas for individual remedial work in the area of basic procedural techniques or selection, organisation and control of language to be taught.

Alternative routes for less experienced teachers pass through the stage of procedural techniques and language selection before reaching the integrative stage of microteaching. By procedural techniques is meant essentially the handling of such classroom activities as drilling and choral repetition. The student is given a set of instructions such as 'Use a substitution drill for choral work in class' and performs the operation required without having to exercise any professional judgement in the wider sense.

Selection, organisation and control of language to be taught is self-explanatory, referring to the problem areas of

structure and lexis, which contain many traps for the unwary and inexperienced EFL teacher.

This model of microteaching as part of a teacher training course is useful because, although analytical in its categorisation of different areas, it concentrates more on the building up of an integrated programme where the parts can be seen in relation to the whole and where the longer term objective is kept constantly in sight. The model also offers a degree of flexibility which allows its use with students of different backgrounds and experience.

Alan Cunningsworth,
Christ Church College,
Canterbury.

Group 3

The group decided not to attempt to define 'skills' and 'techniques' but instead to consider teaching 'abilities'. They drew up a hierarchy of levels of abilities:

1. Abilities in group organisation
   e.g. positive reinforcement, gesture clarity, teacher movement, class management.

2. Abilities in organising learning
   e.g. a) use of aids: blackboard, OHP, etc.
   b) correction, questioning, reading out loud, elicitation, teacher withdrawal, role-play, etc.

3. Abilities in organising language work
   e.g. choral drilling, repetition of model, contextualising, etc.

Group 4

1. Model of teaching process

We chose George Brown's headings of Planning, Performance and Perception (Microteaching, Methuen, 1975) as a way of thinking about teachers' skills. In effect, one is working from the variety of roles/functions one can identify for the teacher when interacting with the group. We did not have time to cross refer this simple PPP with the changing teacher's role according to the stages in language teaching (presentation - production: model - consultant, etc.).

2. Skills

These were the skills discussed:

a) Mechanics of using aids, i.e. handling visuals, tape recorder; exploitation of blackboard, etc.

b) Giving instructions - clarity/non-confusion
- time efficiency

(This refers to organising linguistic and non-linguistic activity. With linguistic activity it can comprise both instruction and exemplification, i.e. implementation of activities planned).

c) Direct elicitation of language (compared with setting up activities that predict or anticipate certain kinds of language use)
- strategic awareness of relation between cue, individual learner and challenge set by cue
- appropriacy of cue to short-term objective

d) Modelling of language
- voice is audible
- model in form clear enough to have desired effect
- 'naturalness' of speech, i.e. speed, rhythm
- attract and maintain attention of pupils

e) Reinforcement
- correction of language (when, how, who by)
- prise, support, criticism

f) 'Social skills'
- 'manner'/'rapport'
- eye contact and 'scan'
- gesture

- voice
- removal of distracting movement
- variation, pausing, clarity

g) 'Involvement of learner'
- i.e. pupil participation and involvement. Relates to above and
- STT/TTT
- speech functions available to pupil, i.e. more than mere directed response

h) Observation and interpretation of learner reaction
- affective
- attention
- achievement of short-term goals set by teacher (recognisable in language performance)

i) Teach (i.e. present and 'explain') meanings
- own knowledge of language, i.e. prior analysis
- explanation/exemplification
- optional modelling
- optional comprehension checking

We did not have time to discuss the question of planning decisions in sequencing and timing of activity types and exploitation of language samples. This is clearly very important but is a skill of a higher order in the 'skills hierarchy'.

3. Microteaching/training methods

Two comments:

A. We saw this as divisible into at least two stages:

i) prescriptive and non-integrated approach (isolated skills/steps; focus on managerial/directive/social skills);

ii) combination of units isolated in i) and progressive involvement of trainee in planning decisions.

B. The conditions we would like to see for training (particularly in-service training) would be:

i) real non-native speaker learners;

ii) a team approach to bridge i) and ii), i.e. individual microteaching; team 'miniclasses';

individual 'miniclasses';

iii) training;

iv) practical training to be in a teaching situation, using knowledge of pupils and curriculum.

Two microteaching units:

A. Teacher function/aim: model a new pattern; achieve oral repetition of pattern

Skills : voice (see above)
managerial - attention
- cue distribution
- cue clarity

Practice method (peer practice) : trainees hear and copy taped models; modelling and repetition in small groups 2 minutes each. Groups of 6.

Feedback : Peers; trainee; tutor (in order)

B. Teacher function/aim: learners comprehend meaning of new form (lexis)

Skills : as above
involvement strategies
selection of method of exemplification or explanation
comprehension checking strategies.
5 minutes each. Pairwork or groups of 3 or 4.

(With peer practice, could use nonsense word to replace lexical item)

Feedback : peers, trainee, tutor (in order)

Jon Roberts,
CALS,
University of Reading

PLENARY DISCUSSION

The aims of microteaching are open to wide interpretation as can be seen from the statements made by seminar participants in their answers to a questionnaire sent out prior to the workshop. Here are a selection of these statements:

1. 'To introduce students to particular skills'.
2. 'To familiarise students with particular techniques and strategies involved in TESL/TEFL'.
3. 'To familiarise students with basic techniques, using material from their course book'.
4. 'To concentrate on basic teacher skills and techniques'.
5. 'To focus on specific skills and micro skills'.
6. 'To allow focusing on specific classroom skills relevant to particular parts of differing types of lesson'.
7. 'To allow microteachers to try out alternative solutions to specified problems'.
8. 'To allow students to practise particular skills in a low risk situation'.
9. 'To provide psychologically accessible models of TEFL, especially for those with no experience'.
10. 'To develop an awareness of the language learner's point of view'.
11. 'To provide an opportunity for students to gain practical experience in a controlled situation with feedback'.
12. 'To provide an opportunity to experiment with methods and/or materials'.
13. 'To raise methodological questions'.
14. 'To initiate constructive mutual criticism and self-criticism'.

The discussion at the plenary session focused on two main areas. The first was the need to orientate students to the goals intended by the tutor so as to avoid misunderstandings that are often a feature of negative responses. The second area was the need to consider the implications of modelling

on microteaching and on teaching in general.

It was felt that students should have prior opportunities to analyse and discuss recordings of teaching before being called upon to embark on microteaching exercises. This experience was necessary so that they would understand more clearly the role of the tutor in relation to their own work.

However, the difficulty of providing live or recorded material for discussion clearly imposes problems. It is impossible to make adequate arrangements for large groups of students to be present in the normal classroom. The alternative is to use recorded material - either tape or film. While acknowledging that genuine material is preferable to scripted recordings the workshop members noted the technical difficulties in obtaining appropriate live recordings, particularly as far as the quality of the sound was concerned. Scripted recordings, such as the British Council series, Teaching Observed, pose other problems in that students are quick to remark on the artificiality of the film, which tends to make them reject the film.

Nevertheless, scripted recordings on film or videotape can be used for observation, analysis and discussion and provided the approach used relates directly to the tasks on microteaching, students should benefit more from these exercises with this sort of preparation than if they were to be plunged into microteaching cold.

A further suggestion was to ask students to present lessons from material with which they were familiar to the group. These demonstrations could also be used to analyse not only the materials being used but could lead to an understanding of the teaching implications in the classroom which, in turn, could feature as specific tasks for subsequent microteaching exercises.

The experiences of students in learning foreign languages could also be used as a basis for discussion and demonstrations of foreign language teaching in languages unknown to the peer group could also provide valuable experiences on

which subsequent microteaching exercises could be based.

The group felt that in the preparation for microteaching particular emphasis needs to be placed on the need for creative evaluation of teaching so that the role of tutor is extended from that of judge and jury to colleague and confidant.

It was also felt that students needed a good introduction to the technical skills involved in making recordings if videotape or any other form of recording was to be used in microteaching.

Finally, in this part of the discussion it was stressed that students should be made aware of and to accept a code of conduct relating to the use of recordings made as part of a microteaching exercise. If students wish they should be given the opportunity to erase any recording they have made. Sometimes students should be given an opportunity of objecting to a recording being used as a basis for group or class discussion. Students should also be made aware of their rights over subsequent use of the recordings. It should be stressed that students have complete control over when and where recordings can be used and are entitled to veto their use without giving any reason for their objections.

The other area of discussion centred on the role of modelling in microteaching. While advantages could be seen in providing students with examples of competent teachers, either directly or in a recorded form, there is always a danger that these performances will force the students to adopt certain norms in their teaching. Modelling is, in effect, a teacher-centred activity based on deficits.

The part which can be played by the tutor demonstrating was also discussed and the advantages and disadvantages this could have on student teachers was examined.

It was generally felt that modelling which led to slavish imitation was to be avoided in that it was inclined to breed a superficial competence and could develop an inflexible approach.

If modelling was to be used effectively it is important to decide if the model is to be acted upon in whole or in part. Student teachers could easily become confused if the point of examining a model was not clearly established.

APPENDIX A

List of participants

A Cunningsworth	Christchurch College, Canterbury, Kent
C H Garwood P W Tench	Department of English, UWIST, Cardiff
M Wallace	Scottish Centre for Education Overseas, Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh
J Greenwood D McKeating	Department of Education, University of Manchester, Manchester
A Barr	The Language Centre, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Newcastle
A Cousins	The College of St Mark and St John, Plymouth
R White J Roberts	Centre for Applied Language Studies, Department of Linguistic Science, University of Reading
H Stratton T Holland	Department of Education, St Mary's College, Twickenham, Middlesex
D Murphy	Department of Education, Lancaster University, Lancaster
R Veltman	The Language Centre, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent
S H McDonough P French	Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex, Colchester, Essex
C Brumfit K Cripwell	EFL Department, University of London Institute of Education, London

British Council

D Clare	Regional Language Officer, English Language Management Unit
Ms H Simpson	Information Assistant (Materials), English Teaching Information Centre
J Kerr	Director, English Language Teaching Institute
M Stimson	Lecturer, English Language Teaching Institute
Ms G Marsh	Consultant, English Language Consultancies
J Stoddart	Consultant, English Language Consultancies
Ms A White	Assistant, English Language Consultancies
Ms M Geddes	On study leave at the Institute of Education